

Application Serial No. 10/715,884
Attorney's Docket No.:16793-002001

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Figures 1A-1D are corrected herein to be labeled as prior art.

The antecedent issue for "the blocked location" has been corrected in claim 1. The "second specified portion" has been changed to "a specified portion which is blocked" in claim 11 to obviate this rejection also.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lindeberg et al. Claim 1 is canceled, and each of claims 2 and 3 are amended into independent form.

Lindeberg et al teaches a system where the connector has certain portions that are blocked and certain portions that are not blocked. Column 4, lines 22-26 explain that the positioning of the electrical contacts can provide a "coding function". This must be taken in the context of the background which explains that different coding keys are used to provide different combinations of unique codes. See column 1, line 21. Nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion that different kinds of electricity be used, much less the specifically-claimed first

Application Serial No. 10/715,884
Attorney's Docket No.: 16793-002001

higher voltage of claim 2, and the DC versus AC voltage of claim 3.

The rejection has ignored claims 2, 3 and 8, however this is respectfully suggested to be incorrect. Intended use of a claimed apparatus may not be enough to distinguish from a prior art apparatus, when the apparatuses are identical. However, this holding, and that contention in general, is certainly not applicable to a method claim. Claims 2 and 3 define use with different voltages, which is different than the prior art. Claim 2, for example, requires preventing the second connector used for the second type of electricity (the lower voltage) into the first connector used for the first type of electricity (the higher voltage). Claim 3 analogously requires this for DC versus AC voltages. Nowhere is this in any way taught or suggested by the cited prior art. Lindeberg only teaches a coding function, and teaches nothing about the defined method of claims 2 and 3 which blocks one connector using the other connector.

Claims 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Dillan. Claim 11 has been amended to emphasize that the portion protrudes by a length longer than any other protruding portions in the first version of the second connector. This is not in any way taught or

Application Serial No. 10/715,894
Attorney's Docket No.:16793-002001

suggested by Dillan. Dillan does include certain kinds of shapes which are incompatible with one another. However, nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion of a portion which protrudes longer than other portions in the first version. By protruding longer, this apparatus can effectively prevent any pins from making contact. Therefore, claim 11 should be allowable along with claim 12 which depend therefrom. Claims 13-15 have been canceled.

Claim 5 should be allowable by virtue of its dependency from claim 2, which has been discussed above.

The indication that claims 7 and 9 represent allowable subject matter is appreciatively noted. These claims are rewritten into independent form, and are retained herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any

Application Serial No. 10/715,884
Attorney's Docket No.:16793-002001


claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, therefore, all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 29, 2004



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10460213.doc

Attachment: Drawing Change